UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,437	07/11/2003	David W. Holmes	CING-118	3221

39013 7590 10/30/2007	EXAMINER
MOAZZAM & ASSOCIATES, LLC	WOZNIAK, JAMES S
7601 LEWINSVILLE ROAD	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

SUITE 304
MCLEAN, VA 22102

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/617,437	HOLMES, DAVID W.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James S. Wozniak	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 August 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   In response to the office action from 3/21/2007, the applicant has submitted an

amendment, filed 8/21/2007, amending the independent claims 1, 7, 9, 15, 17, 20, 23, 25, and 28,

while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the limitation regarding pairing information

comprising unique encryption keys *(Amendment, Pages 12-21)*. The applicant's arguments have

been fully considered but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection in view of

Silvester *(U.S. Patent: 7,254,708)*.

2.   In response to the renumbered claims, the examiner has withdrawn the previous objection

directed towards minor informalities. In the below rejection, the claims will be referred to by

their current numbering status.

3.   In response to amended claims 1, 7, 9, and 15, the examiner has withdrawn the previous

35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection directed to omitted essential structure.

4.   In response to amended claims 17, 20, 23, and 25, the examiner has withdrawn the

previous 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection directed to indefinite claim language.

5.   In response to amended claims 1, 7, 9, 15 and 28, the examiner has withdrawn the

previous 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Response to Arguments

6.   The applicant's arguments with respect to Claim 1 and its dependents *(Amendment,*

Pages 12-13) have been fully considered, but are moot with respect to the new grounds of

rejection in view of Silvester *(U.S. Patent: 7,254,708).*

The applicant argues the art rejection of claims 7, 17 *(8 and 18 in the response)*, 28, and

analogous claims for reasons similar to claim 1 *(i.e., authentication or encryption keys)*

(Amendment, Pages 13-15), but such limitations of claim 1 are not similarly recited in the

aforementioned claims. As a result, the previous rejection is maintained. In response to

applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is

noted that the features upon which applicant relies *(i.e., authentication or encryption keys, secure*

connection establishment) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are

interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the

claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Also, amended

claims 17, 20, 23, and 25 include "for secure communication between wireless devices" which is

not given any patentable weight because it only appears in the preamble.

With respect to dependent Claim 29, the applicant argues that the network address taught

by Thomas et al *(U.S. Patent Application Publication: 2002/0065663)* is not specific to a

wireless device, however, the examiner points out that a network address may be permanently

assigned to a specific device *(Paragraph 0020)*. Thus, Thomas discloses the aforementioned claim limitation.

The applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 3, 8 (9 in the response), and other similar claims *(Amendment, Pages 15-16)* have been fully considered, but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection in view of Silvester *(U.S. Patent: 7,254,708)*.

The applicant arguments with respect to Claims 3 and 8 would, however, seem to apply to claims 8 and 16 and will therefore be addressed with respect to Haller et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,845,097)*. The applicant argues that Haller fails to teach a "synchronization process where a first device may perform acts to begin the pairing process and signal a second device to perform acts that begin the pairing process for the second device" *(Amendment, Page 16)*. However, such a synchronization process is not recited in the claimed invention. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies *(i.e., the aforementioned synchronization process)* are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claimed invention instead recites synchronizing "the application of the control signals with pairing of the other device". Accordingly, Haller teaches periodic messaging between two Bluetooth devices *(Col. 7, Lines 1-15)*, which if combined with the teachings of Thomas would allow for synchronizing audio output and the resulting recognized control signals with the opening of a communication channel *(i.e., pairing of the other device)*, each time a periodic update request is recognized. Thus, the

rejection of claims 8 and 16 is maintained. This response would also apply to analogous claim 19.

The applicant traverses the art rejection of claim 6 and analogous claims based on the allegation that Thomas and Haller et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,845,097)* are from different fields of endeavor and that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine their teachings. In response, the examiner points out that, as noted in the prior Office Action *(Page 9)*, Thomas and Haller are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in device pairing systems utilizing speech recognition and one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, would have been motivated to combine their teachings for the benefit of providing a well-known alternative command type to a voice command that is capable of accessing a device pairing message over a telephone network *(Haller, Col. 6, Lines 31-37)*. Thus, the combination of Thomas and Haller is proper.

The applicant's arguments with respect to Claim 9 (claim 10 in the response) *(Amendment, Pages 17-18)* have been fully considered, but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection in view of Silvester *(U.S. Patent: 7,254,708)*.

The applicant's arguments with respect to Claim 13 (claim 14 in the response) *(Amendment, Pages 17-18)* have been fully considered, but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection in view of Silvester *(U.S. Patent: 7,254,708)*.

The applicant argues the art rejection of claim 15 *(16 in the response)*, for reasons similar to claim 1 *(i.e., authentication or encryption keys) (Amendment, Pages 18-19)*, but such limitations of claim 1 are not similarly recited in the aforementioned claim. As a result, the previous rejection is maintained. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to

show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant

relies *(i.e., authentication or encryption keys, secure connection establishment)* are not recited in

the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations

from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26

USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

With respect to Claims 4, 13, and 29 (4, 12, and 29 in the response), the applicant argues

that Cannon et al *(U.S. Patent: 7,155,163)* fails to teach a pairing code common to a particular

model of wireless device *(Amendment, Page 20)*. In response the examiner points out that

Cannon teaches sharing pairing codes among devices of a similar type (*i.e., model- for example*

music device model types) (Col. 5, Lines 12-20). Thus, Cannon teaches the aforementioned

claim limitation.

The art rejection of the remainder of the dependent claims is traversed for reasons similar

to their corresponding independent/dependent claims *(Amendment, Pages 13-15)*. In regards to

such arguments, see the response directed to the appropriate independent/dependent claims.

Claim Objections

7.   Claims 5 and 13 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent

form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to

cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or

rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 5 and 13 recite a pairing code specific to the

wireless device, which is already respectively recited in claims 1 and 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9.   **Claims 7, 17-18, 28, and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Thomas et al *(U.S. Patent Application Publication: 2002/0065663).*

With respect to **Claim 7**, Thomas recites:

A microphone *(Fig. 7, Element 14)*;

A processor *(speech recognition processor, Paragraph 0022)*; and

Logic which, in communication with the processor, converts signals produced by the

microphone into control signals, and applies the control signals to effect pairing of the wireless

device with another device *(converting a device address to a control signal to enable device*

pairing, Paragraph 0022).

With respect to **Claim 17**, Thomas recites:

First wireless device converting pairing information for a second wireless device into

audible signals and the first wireless device communicating the audible signals to the second

wireless device *(speech synthesis of pairing information and speech output via a speaker,*

Paragraphs 0020 and 0030);

The second wireless device converting the audible signals into control signals and the second wireless device applying the control signals to effect pairing with the first wireless device *(speech recognition of pairing data and control signal generation, Paragraphs 0022 and 0030).*

With respect to **Claim 18**, Thomas discloses the speech recognition processing as applied to Claim 17.

With respect to **Claim 28**, Thomas recites:

A first wireless device converting pairing information for a second wireless device into audible signals *(Paragraph 0020 and Fig. 1, Element 12)*;

The first wireless device communicating the audible signals to a human *(Paragraph 0020 and Fig. 1, Element 13)*;

The subscriber providing inputs corresponding to the audible signals to the second wireless device *(Paragraph 0022 and Fig. 1, Element 5)*;

The second wireless device converting the inputs into control signals *(Paragraph 0022 and Fig. 1, Element 15)*; and

The second wireless device applying the control signals to effect pairing with the first wireless device *(Paragraph 0022)*.

With respect to **Claim 30**, Thomas further discloses:

A pairing code specific to the wireless device *(device-specific address, Paragraph 0020)*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   **Claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, and 13**are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Thomas et al *(U.S. Patent Application Publication: 2002/0065663)* in view of Silvester

(U.S. Patent: 7,254,708).

With respect to **Claim 1**, Thomas recites:

Pairing information for a first wireless device *(address of another device stored in a*

memory register, Paragraph 0020; and pairing message received from another device,

Paragraph 0022);

Pairing information for another wireless device *(address stored in a memory register to*

be sent to another device for establishing a link, Paragraph 0020);

A processor coupled to the wireless device *(Speech synthesis address generation*

processor Fig. 7, Element 12);

A speaker coupled to the processor to communicate audible signals *(Fig. 7, Element 13)*;

and

Logic which, in communication processor, converts the pairing information for the other

wireless device to audible signals, and communicates the audible signals to be communicated via

the speaker *(reading and synthesizing a device address stored in a memory register, Paragraph 0020).*

Although Thomas establishes that it is well known in the art to implement wireless device connection using speech recognition/synthesis technologies, Thomas only recites establishing such a connection using an IP address not an encryption key that is unique to each first and second wireless device. Silvester, however, discloses the concept of using voice signals to connect two Bluetooth devices, wherein the voice signal is an audio rendition of an encryption code that is unique to a wireless device *(Col. 5, Lines 46-62; Col. 6, Lines 40- Col. 7, Line 3; Col. 9, Line 58- Col. 10, Line 19; Col. 11, Line 60- Col. 12, Line 4; Col. 14, Lines 35-51; and Col. 19, Lines 41-56).*

Thomas and Silvester are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in voice-enabled device connection. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to expand the teachings of Thomas with the concept of connecting Bluetooth devices using voice information as taught by Silvester in order to uncomplicatedly enable secure connections between Bluetooth devices without requiring a user to enter a long series of numbers *(Silvester, Col. 5, Lines 46-62; and Col 1, Lines 42-53).*

With respect to **Claim 2**, Thomas further discloses:

Logic which, when applied to the processor, performs acts defined by the pairing information for the wireless device *(converting address data to speech using a vocabulary and receiving a pairing message from a second device, Paragraph 0020).*

With respect to **Claim 3**, Silvester further discloses a challenge/response scheme used to pair wireless devices *(Col. 12, Line 66- Col. 13, Line 14)*, while Thomas discloses the speech synthesis output generated to enable device connections, as applied to claim 1.

With respect to **Claim 5**, Silvester further discloses:

Pairing code specific to the wireless device *(unique keys, Col. 5, Lines 46-62)*.

With respect to **Claim 9**, Thomas recites:

A processor *(Speech synthesis address generation processor Fig. 7, Element 13)*;

A speaker coupled to the processor to communicate audible signals *(Fig. 7, Element 13)*;

and

Logic which, when applied to the processor, converts the pairing information for the other wireless device to audible signals, and communicates the audible signals via the speaker *(reading and synthesizing a device address stored in a memory register, Paragraph 0020)*.

Although Thomas establishes that it is well known in the art to implement wireless device connection using speech recognition/synthesis technologies, Thomas only recites establishing such a connection using an IP address not an encryption key that is unique to each first and second wireless device. Silvester, however, discloses the concept of using voice signals to connect two Bluetooth devices, wherein the voice signal is an audio rendition of an encryption code that is unique to a wireless device *(Col. 5, Lines 46-62; Col. 6, Lines 40- Col. 7, Line 3; Col. 9, Line 58- Col. 10, Line 19; Col. 11, Line 60- Col. 12, Line 4; Col. 14, Lines 35-51; and Col. 19, Lines 41-56)*. Silvester further discloses a challenge/response scheme in which pairing information from another wireless device is acquired/communicated over a wireless network *(Col. 5, Line 46- Col. 6, Line 2; and Col. 12, Line 66- Col. 13, Line 14)*.

Thomas and Silvester are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor

in voice-enabled device connection. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art, at the time of invention, to expand the teachings of Thomas with the concept of

connecting Bluetooth devices using voice information as taught by Silvester in order to

uncomplicatedly enable secure connections between Bluetooth devices without requiring a user

to enter a long series of numbers *(Silvester, Col. 5, Lines 46-62; and Col 1, Lines 42-53)*.

With respect to **Claim 10**, Thomas further discloses:

Logic which, when applied to the processor, performs acts defined by the pairing

information for the wireless device *(converting address data to speech using a vocabulary and*

receiving a pairing message from a second device, Paragraph 0020).

Claim 11 contains subject matter similar to Claim 3, and thus, is rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 13 contains subject matter similar to Claim 5, and thus, is rejected under similar

rationale.

12.   **Claim 29** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al in

view of Cannon et al *(U.S. Patent: 7,155,163)*.

With respect to **Claim 29**, Thomas teaches the wireless device that establishes a

connection with another wireless device through synthesized audio, as applied to Claim 28.

Thomas does not specifically disclose device pairing codes common to a wireless device model,

however Cannon discloses a pairing code common to a particular model of wireless device *(Col.*

5, Lines 12-20).

Thomas and Cannon are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in device pairing systems utilizing speech recognition. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Thomas with the pairing code taught by Cannon in order to enable multiple devices carrying the same code to be paired automatically *(Col. 5, Lines 12-20)*.

13.   **Claims 4 and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al in view of Silvester and further in view of Cannon et al *(U.S. Patent: 7,155,163)*.

With respect to **Claim 4,** Thomas in view of Silvester teaches the wireless device that establishes a connection with another wireless device through synthesized audio, as applied to Claim 1. Thomas in view of Silvester does not specifically disclose device pairing codes common to a wireless device model, however Cannon discloses a pairing code common to a particular model of wireless device *(Col. 5, Lines 12-20)*.

Thomas, Silvester, and Cannon are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in device pairing systems utilizing speech recognition. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Thomas in view of Silvester with the pairing code taught by Cannon in order to enable multiple devices carrying the same code to be paired automatically *(Col. 5, Lines 12-20)*.

Claim 12 contains subject matter similar to Claim 4, and thus, is rejected under similar rationale.

14.   **Claims 6 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas

et al in view of Silvester and further in view of Haller et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,845,097)*.

With respect to **Claim 6**, Thomas in view of Silvester teaches the wireless device that

establishes a connection with another wireless device through synthesized audio, as applied to

Claim 1. Thomas in view of Silvester does not teach that the audio information corresponds to

DTMF tones, however, Haller recites device pairing codes in the form of DTMF tones *(Col. 6,*

Lines 22-37).

Thomas, Silvester, and Haller are analogous art because they are from a similar field of

endeavor in device pairing systems utilizing speech recognition. Thus, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings

of Thomas in view of Silvester with the use of DTMF tones taught by Haller in order to provide

a well-known alternative command type to a voice command that is capable of accessing a

device pairing message over a telephone network *(Haller, Col. 6, Lines 31-37)*.

Claim 14 contains subject matter similar to Claim 6, and thus, is rejected under similar

rationale.

15.   **Claims 8, 15-16, and 19-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Thomas et al in view of Haller et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,845,097)*.

With respect to **Claim 15**, Thomas recites:

A microphone *(Fig. 7, Element 14)*;

A processor *(speech recognition processor, Paragraph 0022)*; and

Logic which, when applied to the processor, converts signals produced by the microphone into control signals, and applies the control signals to effect pairing of the wireless device with another device *(converting a device address to a control signal to enable device pairing, Paragraph 0022).*

Thomas does not specifically suggest that speech signals are applied to a network to affect device pairing, however Haller recites a network server that receives a pairing request in the form of speech, recognizes the pairing request, and sends a pairing message to a wireless device *(Col. 6, Lines 22-37).*

Thomas and Haller are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in device pairing systems utilizing speech recognition. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Thomas with the network server taught by Haller in order to provide a means for confirming and authorizing device pairing *(Haller, Col. 7, Lines 35-37).*

With respect to **Claim 8 and 16**, Thomas discloses the wireless device as applied to Claims 7 and 15 that receives a prompt for address generation, automatically outputs an audible address, and waits for a pairing message response from a second device *(Paragraphs 0020-0022).* Thomas does not specifically suggest that the output of an audio signal is synchronized with pairing information, however Haller discloses a process that periodically updates device pairing *(Col. 7, Lines 1-15),* which when combined with the teachings of Thomas, would yield synchronized audio output with every address retrieval step *(i.e., audio output provided at each update request).*

Thomas and Haller are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in

device pairing systems utilizing speech recognition. Thus, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Thomas

with the periodic updating of pairing information taught by Haller in order to enable subsequent

automatic device pairing *(Haller, Col. 7, Lines 47-51).*

Claim 19 contains subject matter similar to Claim 16, and thus, is rejected for the same

reasons.

With respect to **Claim 20**, Thomas recites:

A processor *(Speech synthesis address generation processor Fig. 7, Element 13)*;

A speaker *(Fig. 7, Element 13)*; and

Logic which, when applied to the processor, converts the pairing information for the

other wireless device to audible signals, and communicates the audible signals via the speaker to

effect wireless device pairing *(reading and synthesizing a device address stored in a memory*

register, Paragraph 0020-22).

Thomas does not specifically suggest that device information is sent to a network to

affect device pairing, however Haller recites a network server that receives a PIN identifying

another wireless device and sends a pairing message to a first wireless device *(Col. 6, Lines 22-*

37).

Thomas and Haller are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in

device pairing systems utilizing speech recognition. Thus, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Thomas

with the network server taught by Haller in order to provide a means for confirming and

authorizing device pairing *(Haller, Col. 7, Lines 35-37)*.

With respect to **Claim 21**, Thomas discloses the speech recognition processing as applied

to Claim 17.

Claim 22 contains subject matter similar to Claim 16, and thus, is rejected for the same

reasons.

Claim 23 contains subject matter similar to Claim 20 (the second claim 20), and thus, is

rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 24 contains subject matter similar to Claim 16, and thus, is rejected for the same

reasons.

Claim 25 contains subject matter similar to Claim 15, and thus, is rejected for the same

reasons.

With respect to **Claim 26**, Thomas further recites a response message sent by a wireless

device to affect device pairing *(Paragraph 0022)*.

With respect to **Claim 27**, it would be obvious within the scope of the teachings of

Thomas to incorporate speech synthesis/recognition capabilities in both devices to enable pairing

initiation from either device *(Paragraphs 0020-0022 and Paragraph 0031)*.

Conclusion

16.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

17.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure:

Jablon *(U.S. PG Publication: 2004/0073795)-* discloses the use of cryptographic keys

used to secure network communications between pairs of wireless devices, wherein the key can

be spoken and recognized in a speech recognizer (see abstract and Paragraph 0125).

18.　Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached at (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James S. Wozniak
9/26/2007

PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER